

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-15, 18-57, and 59-99 are pending.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 18, 26-28, 30, 31, 37, 40, 44, 47-49, 59, 60, 62, 66, 69, 75, 81, 87, 93 and 94 have been amended, and claims 5, 11, 22-25, 51, 65, 68, 70, 74, 86, 88-91, 95 and 98 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-15, 18-21, 26-50, 52-57, 59-64, 66, 67, 69, 71-73, 75-85, 87, 92-94, 96, 97 and 99 would be pending.

The Applicants' representatives wish to thank the Examiner for the in person interview of April 26, 2006. In view of the Examiner's suggestions to facilitate prosecution, the Applicants have generally amended the claims as noted above, for example, to improve as a formal matter the readability of the independent claims 1, 59, 60 and 93 and to reduce the number of claims in general. A number of the dependent claims have also been amended to depend directly from the base claim (e.g., claim 1). In the event the Examiner has any further questions or suggestions to facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative.

For the convenience of the Examiner, the Applicants' remarks in the prior amendment and response of March 27, 2006 are resubmitted below for consideration along with these new changes to some of the claims.

**II. Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection:**

Claims 1-15, 18-57 and 59-93 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable

over (1) claims 1-58 of co-pending application serial no. 09/938,866 (filed on 8/24/01), (2) claims 1-42 of application serial no. 10/116,932 (filed on 4/5/02), (3) claims 1-37 of application serial no. 10/117,514 (filed on 4/5/02), (4) claims 1-51 of application serial no. 10/387,002 (filed on 3/12/03), and (5) claims 1-42 of application serial no. 10/387,005 (filed on 3/12/03).

As these obviousness-type double patenting rejections are provisional, the Applicants will address them at an appropriate time when at least one or more claims of the current application are deemed to contain allowable subject matter (notwithstanding this rejection).

Further, the current application is the earliest filed of these U.S. applications. As such, reconsideration of the appropriateness of these rejections in the current application is respectfully requested. See MPEP § 804.

### **III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101:**

Claims 59 and 93 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, claims 59 and 93 have been amended (in the prior amendment) to reflect a "storage medium", and are believed to be directed to statutory subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

### **IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103:**

Claims 1-3, 13, 15, 21-44, 47-57, 59-63, 71, 77, 79 and 93 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,682).

Claims 4, 7-8 and 64-70 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Broder (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,135). Claims 9-12, 14, 18-20, 45-46, 72-76 and 78 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Bates (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,890).

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an arrangement involving at least extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data, assigning an index that includes the extracted keyword to the web page data, and saving the web page in correspondence with the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit. The saved web page data is sufficient to regenerate at least a portion of the web page.

On the contrary, in Peterson, the index is simply supplied with the Web page by a server. Thus, Peterson does not disclose or suggest the claimed extracting a keyword from a content of an acquired web page data, and then assigning an index including the extracted keyword to the web page data. It necessarily follows that Peterson also does not disclose or suggest the claimed saving the web page data in correspondence with the extracted keyword.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated and are distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination. For similar reasons, claims 59, 60 and 93 and their dependent claims are also not anticipated and are distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination.

#### **V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103:**

Claims 80-92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,527).

Independent claim 80 is directed to a method involving (1) extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser, and (2) displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area. That is, the web page and extracted data within a predetermined meta tag from the web page are displayed.

Singhal as relied upon by the Examiner simply describes a meta search engine and exemplary prior art web site (e.g., Fig. 2 – Allforone) which allows a user to search a plurality of different search engines with a single search query. The meta search engine ranks the search results based on title, etc. and provides the ranked results to the user side for display on the user's browser. This ranking operation is performed on the meta search engine side, and not on the browser receiving side. Accordingly, Singhal is silent as to any extracting of data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser, and is also silent as to the display of the web page and the display of the extracted data in an area outside the display area of the web page.

The Examiner also does not address various aspects as claimed with reasonable particularity. For example, in addressing the claimed displaying operation, the Examiner relies on Fig. 2 of Singhal which simply shows a web page for the meta search engine. This web page shows the individual search engines from which a search can be conducted through the meta search engine web site. The Office Action, however, does not indicate (1) where Fig. 2 shows any extracted data as claimed and (2) where Fig. 2 shows the display of extracted data in an area outside the display area of the web page.

In view of the foregoing, claim 80 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Singhal and are distinguishable over the same. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No.

. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4233-4002. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 5/11/06

By: 

James Hwa  
Registration No. 42,680  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101